



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Michael J. Johnson, AICP
Agency Director

E. J. Ivaldi, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3080 • www.placer.ca.gov

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

Project Title: Mulic Minor Land Division	Plus# PMLD 20130196
Entitlement(s): Minor Land Division	
Site Area: 10.06 acres	APN: 071-031-006
Location: Sage Road on west side of Placer Hills Road, Weimar, Placer County	

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Description:

The applicant is requesting approval of a Minor Land Division of a 10.06-acre property in order to create four parcels consisting of 2.73 acres, 2.54 acres, 2.47 acres and 2.32 acres. The proposed project would create four buildable residential parcels. The project includes the access of one Parcel directly onto Sage Road and the three other Parcels access Sage Road from a private road. The project includes the widening of an existing 10-foot wide single-family driveway to a 20-foot wide private road with two two-foot aggregate-base shoulders. In addition, the project includes the widening of an existing 10-foot wide single-family driveway to an 18-foot wide shared residential driveway standard with two one-foot aggregate-base shoulders. Additional on- and off-site widening of Sage Road to a minimum of 20 feet in width may also be required to meet the minimum pavement width requirements of the Placer County Land Development Manual.

Project Site (Background/Existing Setting):

The subject property consists of approximately ten acres and is located at 1040 Sage Road in the Weimar area. The property is zoned RA-B-100 (Residential Agriculture, combining minimum Building Site size of 2.3 acres). The property is currently undeveloped and contains a vegetative community identified as montane conifer forest by a Biological and Wetlands Resource Assessment that was prepared by Salix Consulting, Inc. on August 28, 2013. A

Timber Harvest Plan was recently issued and executed on the subject property for the purposes of thinning the heavy tree coverage on the property and clearing the understory of the tree canopy for fire safety purposes. Resulting tree coverage on the property is considered moderate. The property is relatively level, sloping slightly towards the east.

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan/Community Plan Designations	Existing Conditions and Improvements
Site	RA-B-100 (Residential Agriculture, combining minimum Building Site size of 2.3 acres)	Rural Estate 2.3-4.6 acre minimum	Undeveloped
North	Same as project site	Same as project site	Same as project site
South	Same as project site	Same as project site	Same as project site
East	Same as project site	Same as project site	Same as project site
West	Same as project site	Same as project site	Same as project site

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency would use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It will also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference will occur:

- ➔ Placer County General Plan EIR
- ➔ Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan EIR

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or will be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division Office, 565 West Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.

- b) "Less Than Significant Impact" applies where the project's impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.
- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)				X
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Items I-1,2:

The subject property is not located within a scenic vista or a state scenic highway and as a result, will not have an adverse effect on scenic resources.

Discussion- Items I-3,4:

The subject property consists of 10.6 and is currently undeveloped. The proposed project would create four buildable residential parcels. Construction of four single-family residences would have the potential to degrade the visual character or quality of the site and create a new source of light or glare. However, the subject property is located in a rural area that consists of parcels ranging in size from approximately 1 to 20 acres and are developed with single-family residences. Because of this, the additional light or glare created by the new residences would be considered negligible. While the construction of a new residence would modify the visual character and quality of the proposed parcels, such a change is considered less than significant considering the parcels' location within a rural, residential area and because the parcel is zoned for residential development. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL & FOREST RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract or a Right-to-Farm Policy? (PLN)				X
4. Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))? (PLN)				X
5. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in the loss or conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) or forest land to non-				X

agricultural or non-forest use? (PLN)				
---------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

Discussion- All Items:

The subject property is not considered Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance. The subject property is located within a rural residential area, with the majority of the surrounding properties developed with single family residences. While Residential Agriculture zoning allows for some agricultural uses, there are no agricultural operations located on or immediately adjacent to the subject property that would require a land use buffer. A parcel located to the west of the subject property is zoned for timberland production. However, a buffer is provided between the subject property and the property zoned for timberland production by a 7.5 acre parcel. For this reason, the development of four residential parcels on the subject property will have no impact on the timberland production property.

In addition, the proposed project would not conflict with existing zoning for forest land or for an agricultural use, and none of the surrounding properties are within a Williamson Act contract. Finally, the proposed project would not result in changes to the existing environmental that would result in the loss or conversion of Farm or Forest land.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (PLN, Air Quality)		X		
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:

The project site is located within the Sacramento Valley Air Basin (SVAB) and is under the jurisdiction of the Placer County APCD. The SVAB is designated as nonattainment for federal and state ozone (O₃) standards, nonattainment for the federal particulate matter standard (PM_{2.5}) and state particulate matter standard (PM₁₀).

The project proposes a minor land division to create three additional parcels, which, in itself would not result in a significant air quality impact to the region. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-2, 3:

Operational related emissions could result from potential future construction of four new dwelling units. The occupancy of four new dwelling units would generate nominal air pollutants and will not violate air quality standards or substantially contribute to existing air quality violations.

The project does not propose construction of any residences at this time. However, a new road is proposed, which may result in one acre or more of site disturbance. If more than one acre of land is to be disturbed at a single time, then the property owner shall submit a Construction Emission/Dust Control Plan as defined in the following mitigation measure.

In addition, site development would be subject to all applicable Best Management Practices for dust and erosion control. With incorporation of the following standard practices for dust control, construction related air quality impacts are considered less than significant.

Mitigation Measures- Items III-2,3:

MM III.1 Prior to approval of a Grading Plan, on project sites greater than one acre, the applicant shall submit a Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan to the Placer County APCD. If APCD does not respond within twenty (20) days of the plan being accepted as complete, the plan shall be considered approved. The applicant shall provide written evidence, provided by APCD, to the local jurisdiction (city or county) that the plan has been submitted to APCD. It is the responsibility of the applicant to deliver the approved plan to the local jurisdiction. The applicant shall not break ground prior to receiving APCD approval, of the Construction Emission / Dust Control Plan, and delivering that approval to the local jurisdiction issuing the permit.

MM III.2

- a. In order to control dust, operational watering trucks shall be on site during construction hours. In addition, dry, mechanical sweeping is prohibited. Watering of a construction site shall be carried out in compliance with all pertinent APCD rules (or as required by ordinance within each local jurisdiction).
- b. Include the following standard note on the Grading Plan: The prime contractor shall be responsible for keeping adjacent public thoroughfares clean of silt, dirt, mud, and debris, and shall "wet broom" the streets (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction) if silt, dirt, mud or debris is carried over to adjacent public thoroughfares.
- c. Include the following standard note on the Grading Plan: The contractor shall apply water or use other method to control dust impacts offsite. Construction vehicles leaving the site shall be cleaned to prevent dust, silt, mud, and dirt from being released or tracked off-site.

MM III.3 Include the following standard notes on the Grading Plan:

- a. During construction, traffic speeds on all unpaved surfaces shall be limited to 15 miles per hour or less.
- b. The prime contractor shall suspend all grading operations when wind speeds (including instantaneous gusts) are excessive and dust is impacting adjacent properties.
- c. In order to minimize wind driven dust during construction, the prime contractor shall apply methods such as surface stabilization, establishment of a vegetative cover, paving, (or use another method to control dust as approved by the individual jurisdiction).
- d. The contractor shall suspend all grading operations when fugitive dust exceeds Placer County APCD Rule 228 (Fugitive Dust) limitations. The prime contractor shall be responsible for having an individual who is CARB-certified to perform Visible Emissions Evaluations (VEE). This individual shall evaluate compliance with Rule 228 on a weekly basis. It is to be noted that fugitive dust is not to exceed 40% opacity and not go beyond the property boundary at any time. Lime or other drying agents utilized to dry out wet grading areas shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 228 Fugitive Dust limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits will be notified by APCD and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
- e. Construction equipment exhaust emissions shall not exceed Placer County APCD Rule 202 Visible Emission limitations. Operators of vehicles and equipment found to exceed opacity limits are to be immediately notified by APCD to cease operations and the equipment must be repaired within 72 hours.
- f. A person shall not discharge into the atmosphere volatile organic compounds (VOC's) caused by the use or manufacture of Cutback or Emulsified asphalts for paving, road construction or road maintenance, unless such manufacture or use complies with the provisions of Rule 217.
- g. During construction the contractor shall utilize existing power sources (e.g., power poles) or clean fuel (i.e. gasoline, biodiesel, natural gas) generators rather than temporary diesel power generators.
- h. During construction, the contractor shall minimize idling time to a maximum of 5 minutes for all diesel powered equipment.
- i. During construction, no open burning of removed vegetation shall be allowed unless permitted by the PCAPCD. All removed vegetative material shall be either chipped on site or taken to an appropriate recycling site, or if a site is not available, a licensed disposal site.

Discussion- Items III-4,5:

The project includes minor grading operations which would result in short-term diesel exhaust emissions from on-site heavy-duty equipment and would generate diesel particulate matter (PM) emissions from the use of off-road diesel equipment required for site grading. Operational emissions resulting from the stationary source equipment would be located at a distance from public areas. Because of the dispersive properties of diesel PM and proposed distances from the stationary source equipment from public areas, TAC emissions would not expose sensitive

receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and therefore would have a less than significant effect. The project does not include any sources which would omit odor emissions. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)		X		
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)		X		
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)		X		
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community, including oak woodlands, identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries? (PLN)				X
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federal or state protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) or as defined by state statute, through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)				X
6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nesting or breeding sites? (PLN)		X		
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including oak woodland resources? (PLN)		X		
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items IV-1,2,6:

A Biological and Wetlands Resource Assessment for the subject property was conducted by Salix Consulting, Inc. on August 28, 2013. A field study of the project site determined that the site lacks the appropriate soils and is located in an area that is not known to support rare plant species. However, the assessment determined that the project site provides suitable nesting habitat for raptors known from the region. In order to avoid take of any active raptor nest, the following Mitigation Measure is required:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-1,2,6:

MM IV.1 Prior to building permit application or any site disturbance, including grading or tree removal activities, during the raptor nesting season (March 1 - September 1), a focused survey for raptor nests shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. A report summarizing the survey shall be provided to Placer County and the California Department of Fish & Game (CDFG) within 30 days of the completed survey. If an active raptor nest is identified

appropriate mitigation measures shall be developed and implemented in consultation with CDFG. If construction is proposed to take place between March 1st and September 1st, no construction activity or tree removal shall occur within 500 feet of an active nest (or greater distance, as determined by the CDFG). Construction activities may only resume after a follow up survey has been conducted and a report prepared by a qualified raptor biologist indicating that the nests (or nests) are no longer active, and that no new nests have been identified. A follow up survey shall be conducted 2 months following the initial survey, if the initial survey occurs between March 1st and July 1st. Additional follow up surveys may be required by the DRC, based on the recommendations in the raptor study and/or as recommended by the CDFG. Temporary construction fencing and signage as described herein shall be installed at a minimum 500 foot radius around trees containing active nests. If all project construction occurs between September 1st and March 1st no raptor surveys will be required. Trees previously approved for removal by Placer County, which contain stick nests, may only be removed between September 1st and March 1st. A note which includes the wording of this condition of approval shall be placed on the Improvement Plans. Said plans shall also show all protective fencing for those trees identified for protection within the raptor report.

Discussion- Items IV-4,5:

The project involves the subdivision of an approximately 10 acre parcel into four parcels consisting of 2.73 acres, 2.54 acres, 2.47 acres and 2.32 acres. Approval of the Minor Land Division will create a total of four separately saleable, buildable parcels that can be developed with single-family residences. Surrounding properties are also developed with single-family residences.

A Biological and Wetlands Resource Assessment for the subject property was conducted by Salix Consulting, Inc. on August 28, 2013. Field study of the project site determined that the site contains no waters of the United States or federally protected wetlands.

As the majority of the project site has been previously disturbed and because the majority of the surrounding properties are developed, implementation of the proposed project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations by the California Department of Fish & Game, or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. The proposed project will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife species to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of an endangered, rare threatened species.

Discussion- Items IV-3,7:

The Biological and Wetlands Resource Assessment prepared for the subject property described the vegetative habitat on the property as montane coniferous forest. Montane coniferous forest primarily contains coniferous trees, including ponderosa pine and Douglas fir. However, almost as abundant on the property are black oak and canyon live oak trees.

The tree species located onsite qualify as "protected trees" by the standards of the Placer County Tree Ordinance. These trees include native trees with a diameter at breast height of at least six inches or 10 inches aggregate for multi-trunked trees. Site disturbance from road and driveway improvements and/or residential development on the project site may result in impacts to these protected trees; however, no trees are proposed to be removed as a part of this project. This is due to a Timber Harvest Plan that was executed on the property that allowed for logging of trees on the property in order to thin the tree coverage on the property. The shrubby understory was also removed as a part of this plan. In conjunction with the Timber Harvest Plan, two building sites were rough graded. In addition to these sites, two other areas on the project site have been identified for residential construction due to the absence of trees in these areas. As a result, it is unlikely that the proposed project would result in significant impacts to protected trees. However, in order to ensure that any impacts to protected trees on the project site are mitigated to less than significant levels, the following mitigation measures is required:

Mitigation Measures- Items IV-3,7:

MM IV.3 Prior to approval of Improvement Plans, trees identified for removal, and/or trees with disturbance to its critical root zone, shall be mitigated through replacement with comparable species on-site, in an area to be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC) or through payment of in-lieu fees, as follows:

- A. For each diameter inch of a tree removed, replacement shall be on an inch-for-inch basis. For example, if 100 diameter inches are proposed to be removed, the replacement trees would equal 100 diameter inches (aggregate). If replacement tree planting is proposed, the tree replacement/mitigation plan must be shown on Improvements Plans and must be installed by the applicant and inspected and approved by the Development Review Committee (DRC). At its discretion, the DRC may establish an alternate deadline for

installation of mitigation replacement trees if weather or other circumstances prevent the completion of this requirement.

- B. In lieu of the tree planting mitigation for tree removal listed above, a tree replacement mitigation fee of \$100 per diameter inch at breast height for each tree removed or impacted or the current market value, as established by an Arborist, Forester or Registered Landscape Architect, of the replacement trees, including the cost of installation, shall be paid to the Placer County Tree Preservation Fund.

Discussion- Items IV-8:

Placer County does not have an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan. Therefore, the proposed project will not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No mitigation measures are required.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)			X	
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			X	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)				X
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)				X
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Items V-1,2:

The proposed project consists of a minor land division to create four new single-family residential lots. A Cultural Resources Records search was prepared by the North Central Information Center on August 20, 2013. The records search did not identify any historical or archaeological resources on the subject property. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item V-3:

The records search did not identify any paleontological resources or site or geologic features on the subject property. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item V-4:

Development of the project site would not cause a physical change that would affect unique ethnic cultural values because no resources that would result in such an affect are located on or around the subject property. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion Item V-5:

There are no know religious or sacred activities on or around the subject property and as such, the development of the proposed project will not impact such areas. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item V-6:

There are no known human remains on the subject property. However, human remains could be discovered as a result of site disturbance.

Although no known resources were identified on the project site, there may be undiscovered resources on the site that could be unearthed during development activities. The following standard condition of approval will be required as part of the project permit and a note added to the Improvement Plans:

The following standard condition of approval will be required as part of the project permit:

If any archaeological artifacts, exotic rock (non-native), or unusual amounts of shell or bone are uncovered during any on-site construction activities, all work must stop immediately in the area and a SOPA-certified (Society of Professional Archaeologists) archaeologist retained to evaluate the deposit. The Placer County Planning Department of and Department of Museums must also be contacted for review of the archaeological find(s).

If the discovery consists of human remains, the Placer County Coroner and Native American Heritage Commission must also be contacted. Work in the area may only proceed after authorization is granted by the Placer County Planning Department. A note to this effect shall be provided on the improvement plans for the project.

No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)			X	
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)			X	
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	
4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)			X	
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)		X		
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)			X	
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Chapter 18 of the California Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	

Discussion- Items VI-1,4,9:

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Soil Survey of Placer County and the United States Department of Agriculture ~ Natural Resources Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the proposed project is located on three different soils classified as: Josephine loam, Mariposa-Josephine complex, and Sites loam. The identified soil constraints are the slope of the soil (greater than 15%) and a moderate level of shrink-swell expansive soil. The Soil Survey does not identify any unique geologic or physical features for the existing soil types.

No known unique geologic or physical features exist on the site that will be destroyed or modified. Construction of four additional houses and associated improvements will not create any unstable earth conditions or change any geologic substructure. The project will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code to address building related soil issues and will obtain grading permits as necessary to address grading issues. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No Mitigation Measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-2,3:

The project proposal will result in the construction of four new single family residences with associated infrastructure including roadways/driveways. To construct the improvements proposed, disruption of soils on-site will occur, including excavation/compaction for roadways and various utilities. The area of disturbance for these improvements is relatively small (approximately 6,000 square feet) and the roadway improvements are located adjacent to existing improvements. The proposed project improvements will generally be at the same grade as the existing topography. Therefore, the impacts to soil disruptions and topography are less than significant. No Mitigation Measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-5,6:

The disruption of the soil discussed in Items 2 and 3 above increases the risk of erosion and creates a potential for contamination of storm runoff with disturbed sediment or other pollutants introduced through typical grading practices. In addition, this soil disruption has the potential to modify any existing on site drainageways by transporting erosion from the disturbed area into local drainageways. Discharge of concentrated runoff after construction could also contribute to these impacts in the long-term. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present and occur when soils are disturbed and protective vegetative cover is removed. It is primarily the grading for transportation systems and construction for utilities that are responsible for accelerating erosion and degrading water quality. The project would increase the potential for erosion impacts without appropriate mitigation measures. The project's site specific impacts associated with erosion can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items VI-5,6:

MM VI.1 The applicant shall prepare and submit Grading Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all physical improvements as required by the conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on and off site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. If the Design/Site Review process and/or Development Review Committee (DRC) review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Grading Plans.

The applicant shall provide five (5) copies of the approved Tentative Parcel Map(s) and two copies of the approved conditions with the Grading Plan submittal. The Final Parcel Map(s) shall not be submitted to the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) until the Grading Plans are submitted for the second review. Final technical review of the Final Parcel Map(s) shall not conclude until after the Grading Plans are approved by the ESD. Any Building Permits associated with this project shall not be issued until, at a minimum, the Grading Plans are approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department.

MM VI.2 The Grading Plans shall show all proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) and Stormwater Quality Ordinance (Ref. Article 8.28, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Grading Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected by a member of the Development Review Committee (DRC). All cut/fill slopes shall be at a maximum of 2:1 (horizontal: vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD) concurs with said recommendation. Fill slopes shall not exceed 1.5:1 (horizontal: vertical)

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation, undertaken from April 1 to October 1, shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Grading Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to ensure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization before, during, and after project construction. Soil stockpiling or borrow areas, shall have proper erosion control measures applied for the duration of the construction as specified in the Grading Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD).

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Grading Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

MM VI.3 Water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs), shall be designed according to the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and/or for Industrial and Commercial, (and/or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)).

Construction (temporary) BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: Fiber Rolls (SE-5), Straw Bale Barrier (SE-9), Straw Wattles, Velocity Dissipation Devices (EC-10), Hydroseeding (EC-4), Silt Fence (SE-1), Wind Erosion Control (WE-1), and revegetation techniques.

Discussion- Items VI-7,8:

The project is located within Placer County. The California Department of Mines and Geology classifies the project site as a low severity earthquake zone. The project site is considered to have low seismic risk with respect to faulting, ground shaking, seismically related ground failure and liquefaction. The future residential units will be constructed in compliance with the California Building Code, which includes seismic standards. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No Mitigation Measures are required.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant and/or cumulative impact on the environment? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
2. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	

Discussion- All Items:

Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions of primary concern from land use projects include carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), and nitrous oxide (N₂O). Construction related activities resulting in exhaust emissions may come from fuel combustion for heavy-duty diesel and gasoline-powered equipment, portable auxiliary equipment, material delivery trucks, and worker commuter trips. Operational GHG emissions could result from motor vehicle trips generated by the additional residents, on-site fuel combustion for space and water heating, landscape maintenance equipment, and fireplaces/stoves; and off site emissions at utility providers associated with the project's electricity and water demands.

The project proposes no construction of dwellings at this time, but could result in future grading and construction of four new dwelling units. The construction and operational related GHG emissions resulting from the project would not substantially hinder the State's ability to attain the goals identified in AB 32 (i.e., reduction of statewide GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020; approximately a 30 percent reduction from projected 2020 emissions). Thus, the construction and operation of the project would not generate substantial greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, which may be considered to have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No Mitigation Measures are required.

VIII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (PLN, Air Quality)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X
5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)			X	
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Items VIII-1,2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No Mitigation Measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

There are no school sites located within a quarter mile of the project location. Further, the project does not propose a use that typically would involve any activities that would emit hazardous substances or waste that would affect a substantial number of people and is therefore considered to have a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

The project site is not included on a list of hazardous materials site compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and as a result will not create a significant hazard to the public.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6:

The proposed project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport, public use airport or a private airstrip and would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

The project site is located within an area determined by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to be at Very High risk for wildland fires and is located within a California State Responsibility Area. The project was reviewed by Ian Gow, Fire Chief for the Placer Hills Fire Protection District, who provided correspondence regarding fire safety on the subject property. This correspondence states that the proposed parcels that would result from the parcel map will be served by the Placer Hills Fire Protection District and that fire hydrants would not be required by the project. The correspondence did not include any further recommendations or Conditions of Approval for the project. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-8:

The project will not create a health hazard. Use of the proposed parcels is for single family residential.

Discussion- Item VIII-9:

The project will not expose people to existing sources of potential health hazard.

IX. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any federal, state or county potable water quality standards? (EHS)			X	
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)			X	
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			X	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)			X	
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)			X	
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)			X	
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)			X	

Discussion- Item IX-1:

The existing water wells have had 4 hour well yields and passing bacteriological testing. The wells on lots 1 and 4 have had testing for primary and secondary drinking water standards submitted to PCEHS. With the setback distances required by County Ordinances and California State Law and that the septic systems and water wells must be placed in locations approved by PCEHS, the likelihood of this project to violate any potable water quality standards is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

This minor land division will result in the creation four parcels for residential development. It is anticipated that the relatively low density would result in limited water usage consistent with residential use, such that the risk of depletion of groundwater supplies would be expected to be less than significant. For a minor land division, the low density development would not result in a significant amount of impervious surfaces and therefore the risk that the minor land division would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge would be less then significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The proposed project will ultimately include the construction of improvements for four new single family residential homes and driveways. The home and driveway improvements will be located at or near their existing grade. The overall drainage patterns from the proposed ultimate construction will not be significantly changed. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The proposed project will ultimately include the construction of improvements for four new single family residential homes and driveways. These improvements will add only a small amount of impervious surfaces as compared to the entire project area, approximately 10 acres. No downstream drainage facility or property owner will be significantly impacted. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items IX-5,6:

The area of disturbance for the ultimate project improvements is relatively small for the construction of four single family dwellings and driveways as compared to the entire project area, approximately 10 acres. The proposed improvements will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

This project is not likely to otherwise degrade groundwater quality.

Discussion- Items IX-8,9,10:

The project site is not located within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The ultimate project improvements are not proposed within a local 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows will be redirected after construction of any improvements. The project site is not located within any levee or dam failure inundation area. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item IX-11:

The minor land division will result in the creation of four parcels for residential development. These additional residential parcels will result in limited increased water usage consistent with residential use, such that the potential to alter the direction or rate of flow of ground water would be less than significant.

Discussion- Item IX-12:

The ultimate proposed improvements of four new single family dwellings and driveways will not create runoff water that will substantially increase pollutants or degrade long term surface water quality beyond the existing conditions of any watershed of important water resources. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

X. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)				X
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)			X	
6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)				X
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items X-1,2,3,4,6,7,8:

The proposed project includes the subdivision of a 10.6 acre property in order to create four parcels consisting of 2.73 acres, 2.54 acres, 2.47 acres and 2.32 acres. The subject property is located in the Weimar area and is zoned RA-B-100 (Residential Agriculture, combining minimum Building Site designation of 2.3 acres). The property is within the Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan and is designated Rural Estate 2.3-4.6 acre minimum. The project is consistent with the zoning and community plan designation. The property is bordered on north, west, east and south sides by rural residential development and will be consistent with the immediate surroundings. The proposed project is consistent with the immediate neighborhood and the planned land use for the property, will not divide an established community, and will not cause economic or social changes that would result in adverse physical changes to the environment. The project will not have an impact on conservation plans because there are no resources on the subject property that would fall within the purview of such plans.

Discussion- Item X-5:

There are no agricultural operations on the project site. While the property does contain conifer trees including Douglas Fir and pine, there are not enough located on the subject property to be considered a timber resource. This is because a portion of the trees located on the project site have been removed as a part of a Timber Harvest Plan recently executed on the property. The purpose of the Timber Harvest Plan was to thin tree coverage and remove understory on the subject property for the purposes of fire safety. Due to the completion of the Timber Harvest Plan as such, the proposed project will not have an adverse effect on a timber resource or operation.

In addition, a parcel located to the west of the subject property is zoned for timberland production and a timber operation has occurred on the property in the past. However, a buffer is provided between the property to the west and the subject property by a 7.5 acre parcel. For this reason, the development of four residential parcels on the subject property will have no impact on the timberland production property. No mitigation measures are required.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The Mineral Land Classification of Placer County, California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology 1995, was prepared for the purpose of identifying and documenting the various mineral compounds found in the soils of Placer County. The Classification is comprised of three primary mineral deposit types: those mineral deposits formed by mechanical concentration (placer gold); those mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes (lode gold, silver, copper, zinc and tungsten); and construction aggregate resources, industrial mineral deposits and other deposits formed by magmatic segregation processes (sand, gravel, crushed stone, decomposed granite, clay, shale, quartz and chromite).

With respect to those deposits formed by mechanical concentration, the site and immediate vicinity are classified as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-1, meaning, this is an area where geologic information indicates there is little likelihood for the presence of significant mineral resources. No significant mineral resources have been identified on the property.

With respect to those mineral deposits formed by hydrothermal processes, the site and vicinity have been classified as Mineral Resource Zone MRZ-3a^(h-10). This mineral classification is designated as the Weimar/Gillis Hill Fault Zones (lode gold). The Weimar/Gillis Hill Fault Zones contain cavity-filling, locally gold-bearing quartz veins that at some point may have been mined and yielded significant amounts of gold in the past.

Because the site has never been mined, and because no valuable, locally important mineral resources have been identified on the project site, implementation of the proposed project will result in less than significant impacts to mineral resources.

XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (PLN)			X	
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)			X	
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (PLN)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X

5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (PLN)				X
--	--	--	--	----------

Discussion- Items XII-1,3:

The proposed project will not result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the Placer County General Plan, Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan, or the Placer County Noise Ordinance. Construction associated with the proposed project will create a temporary increase in ambient noise levels, which could adversely affect adjacent residents. However, a Condition of Approval for the project will be required that limits construction hours so that evenings and early mornings, as well as all day on Sunday and federal holidays, will be free of construction noise. This impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XII-2:

The proposed project involves the creation of four undeveloped residential parcels. Vehicle trips generated from the subdivision would be periodic in nature and given the relatively low density of the surrounding area, would not be excessive. The proposed project would not create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XII-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of a public airport and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

Discussion- Item XII-5:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private air strip.

XIII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)			X	
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIII-1:

Because the project includes the development of four single-family residential lots, it will result in a slight increase to population growth. This increase is consistent with the Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan and the Placer County General Plan and has been analyzed as part of these plans. This impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIII-2:

The proposed project will not displace existing housing. The project involves the creation of four undeveloped residential parcels.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (ESD, PLN)			X	
2. Sheriff protection? (ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (ESD, PLN)			X	
5. Other governmental services? (ESD, PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project. The proposed project does not generate the need for new, significant, fire protection facilities as a part of this project. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The proposed project would result in the creation of four new residential single-family lots and would increase the number of residents in the project area. However, this increase would not result in an adverse effect to Sheriff Protection facilities because the small increase in the number of residents is considered negligible and is not beyond the number of residents that were analyzed in the Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-3:

The proposed project would result in the creation of four new residential single-family lots and would increase the number of residents in the project area. However, this increase would not result in an adverse effect to schools in the area. This is because the increase in the number of residents is minimal and does not go beyond those numbers analyzed and planned for in the Weimar/Applegate/Clipper Gap Community Plan. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-4:

The proposed project will not generate any more impacts on the maintenance of public roads than was anticipated with the development of the Community Plan. Therefore, this is a less than significant impact. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XIV-5:

No other governmental services are proposed as part of this project. There is no impact.

XV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that			X	

substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item XV-1:

There would be a negligible increase in the use of existing recreational areas in the surrounding area as a result in the Minor Land Division. The increase will not result in a substantial deterioration of facilities as improvements and/or maintenance of these services is offset by the payment of park fees as a part of the conditioning process. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XV-2:

The project does not include recreational facilities nor require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse effect on the environment.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)		X		
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)				X
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X
7. Conflicts with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle lanes, bicycle racks, public transit, pedestrian facilities, etc.) or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items XVI-1,2:

This project proposal will ultimately result in the construction of four additional residential single family parcels. The proposed project will generate approximately 4 additional PM peak hour trips and approximately 40 average daily trips. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. With the project traffic added to the existing traffic volumes, all area roadway segments and intersections will continue to operate

within acceptable LOS standards. For potential cumulative traffic impacts, the Placer County General Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program, which with payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements, will help reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigation measures:

Mitigation Measures- Items XVI-1,2:

MM XVI.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Meadow Vista), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

- A) County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current estimated fee is \$4,863 per single family residential unit. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If either the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion- Item XVI-3:

The project includes the access of one Parcel directly on to Sage Road and the three other Parcels access Sage Road from a private road. The project includes the widening of an existing 10 foot wide single family driveway to a 20 foot wide private road with 2 – two foot aggregate base shoulders. In addition, the project includes the widening of an existing 10 foot wide single family driveway to an 18 foot wide shared residential driveway standard with 2 – one foot aggregate base shoulders. Additional on- and off-site widening of Sage Road to a minimum of 20 feet in width may also be required to meet the minimum pavement width requirements of the Placer County Land Development Manual. All driveway and roadway improvements would meet Placer County standards. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-4:

The servicing fire district has reviewed the proposed project and has not identified any impacts to emergency access. The proposed project does not impact the access to any nearby use. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-5:

The proposed project does not generate the need for any additional parking spaces and will meet the parking standards laid out in section 17.54.060(B)(5)(Parking) of the Placer County Zoning Ordinance. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVI-6:

The proposed project will be constructing driveway improvements that do not create any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XVI-7:

The proposed project will not conflict with any existing policies or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation. Therefore, there is no impact.

Discussion- Item XIV-8:

The project is not result in a change in air traffic patterns including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.

XVII. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)			X	

2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)			X	
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs in compliance with all applicable laws? (EHS)			X	

Discussion- Items XVII-1,2,6:

The proposed project will utilize septic systems for the method of sewage disposal and water wells for the method of water service. Therefore, there is no impact. No Mitigation Measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-3:

The project will result in the construction of new on-site sewage disposal systems. Soils testing has been conducted by a qualified consultant and reports submitted showing the types of septic systems required on each of the proposed parcels that will adequately treat the sewage effluent generated by the project. A total of four sewage disposal systems will be located on a total parcel area of 10 acres in size and thus the impacts from these septic systems is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-4:

Storm water will be collected and conveyed in the existing drainage facilities. The existing system has the capacity to accept flows from the proposed project since the proposed project will only generate a minor increase in flows from the pre development condition. No new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities is required. Therefore, this impact is less than significant.

Discussion- Item XVII-5:

Each proposed parcel will be served by an onsite domestic water well that meets minimum water quantity standards for single family residential development. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XVII-7:

The project lies in an area of the County that is served by the local franchised refuse hauler and is served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity. The concern whether this project is served by a landfill with sufficient capacity is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially impact biological resources, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X

2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Services Division, Melanie Jackson, Chairperson
 Planning Services Division, Air Quality, Gerry Haas
 Engineering and Surveying Division, Phil Frantz
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Department of Public Works, Traffic Fees, Amber Conboy
 Environmental Health Services, Justin Hansen
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Andy Fisher
 CALFire, Brad Albertazzi



Signature _____ Date January 17, 2014
 E. J. Ivaldi, Environmental Coordinator

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603. For Tahoe projects, the document will also be available in our Tahoe Division office, 775 North Lake Blvd., Tahoe City, CA 96145.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Air Pollution Control District Rules & Regulations
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Services Division	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Division, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tentative Map _____
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Planning Services Division, Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> CalEEMod Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____